DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 318 107 EA 021 737

AUTHOR Baptist, Beth Jones
TITLE State Certification Requirements for School Superintendents. Improving the Preparation of School Administrators. Notes on Reform No. 7.
INSTITUTION National Policy Board for Educational Administration, Charlottesville, VA.
PUB DATE Dec 89
NOTE 29p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; Administrator Evaluation; Administrator Qualifications; *Administrator Selection; *Certification; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Superintendents

ABSTRACT

State certification requirement are both an area of needed improvement and a vehicle for reform. A study was conducted to inventory the requirements for state certification of superintendents, to identify the similarities and differences between and among the states, and to compare the current status of superintendent certification to recommendations for improving the preservice preparation of school administrators. Requests for a detailed explanation of superintendent certification requirements were sent to the chief certification officers at state departments of education in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The response rate was 100 percent. The results indicated that no two states had exactly the same standards for the certification of superintendents; however, categories of requirements common to many states were identified from an analysis of the documents provided by the state education agencies. Specifically: (1) 41 states required the completion of a specific graduate degree as a requirement for certification of superintendents; (2) 22 states reported a specific number of graduate hours required for certification; (3) 38 state education agencies identified specific course requirements; and (4) only 26 of the 51 departments of education required a specific number of years of classroom experience. A discussion of the results is included. (15 references) (KM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED318107

ng
eparation
hool
inistrators
s on Reform

State Certification Requirements For School Superintendents

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jessy A. Astuto

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Publication of the National Policy Board for Educational Administration

EA 021 737

NOTES
ON
REFORM

No. 7, December 1989

The National Policy Board for Educational Administration

Headquarted at

University of Virginia
Curry School of Education
183 Ruffner Hall
Charlottesville, VA 22903

State Certification Requirements For School Superintendents

Beth Jones Baptist
Curry School of Education
University of Virginia

NOTES ON REFORM

Notes on Reform is a publication of the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. The purpose of this series is to disseminate information about programs, projects, ideas, or issues related to the improvement of preparation programs for school administrators. Program descriptions, project evaluations, strategies for improvement, research reports, policy proposals, think pieces -- or any other form of information about innovations or proposed program improvements in educational administration -- could be a source of ideas for others interested in reforming our field. Requests should be forwarded to staff headquarters for the National Policy Board: University of Virginia, Curry School of Education, 405 Emmet Street, Charlottesville, VA 22903, attention Terry A. Astuto or Linda C. Winner (Co-Editors), or Deborah A. Polen (Assistant Editor), (804-924-0583).

State Certification Requirements
For School Superintendents

A steady increase in activities to improve the preparation of educational leaders is apparent in professional associations of school administrators, university departments of educational administration, and state education agencies. An area that has come under intense scrutiny is state-level certification of school administrators. Numerous policy makers -- including governors, legislators, state commissioners, and others -- have turned their attention to strengthening state standards controlling the licensing or certification of superintendents, principals, and supervisors.

However, a picture of the commonalities and differences that exist between and among the states is hazy. The purposes of the study reported here were to: (1) inventory the requirements for state certification of superintendents; (2) identify the similarities and differences between and among the states; and (3) to compare the current status of superintendent certification to recommendations for improving the pre-service preparation of school administrators. The findings indicate that some of the current standards (e.g., focus on a comprehensive and relevant core of knowledge, experiential prerequisites, opportunities for practice) touch on the building blocks of reform. Others (e.g., focus on the managerial tasks of schools, regulations that reduce the significance of internship opportunities, accumulation of course hours rather than completion of approved programs) continue the cycle of accommodations that contribute to the weaknesses characteristic of the field.

Beth Jones Baptist
Curry School of Education
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, VA 22903

STATE CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS

Responsibility for the preparation of school administrators rests with several influential actors, including colleges and universities, state and national associations which represent the practicing profession, and state-level policy makers. Colleges and universities design and deliver the graduate-level programs to aspiring and practicing school administrators. Professional associations represent the needs, norms, and preferences of the practicing profession. State-level policy makers -- either in legislatures, governors' offices, or state education agencies -- regulate the entry of persons to the education profession. Improving the preparation of educational leaders will require the coordinated efforts of all of these key actors.

State certification requirements are both an area of needed improvement and a vehicle for reform. In recent years, modifications and adjustments have been made in the certification requirements for school administrators. Since these changes occur in the fifty states and the District of Columbia, keeping track of the requirements and the changes is difficult. Changes take time and are reported slowly. Yet, a picture of the commonalities and differences in state certification standards is important for all the parties currently involved in the reform of educational administration.

The purpose of this paper is to report the results of a study of certification requirements for one educational leadership position -- the school superintendent.

Background

Certification requirements for superintendents were non-existent prior to the twentieth century. Beliefs and expectations regarding the roles of superintendents have shifted during this century due to the changing ideas of the public about schools and schooling, population shifts, increased complexity of the education enterprise, and recognition of the variety of social issues that impact on the schools.

A 1939 study completed by the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) reported that thirty-three states issued administration certificates; however, only nineteen states considered the certificates a condition for appointment. Even when certificates were required, the requirements were meager and preparation in educational administration or supporting disciplines was minimal (Campbell, Fleming, Newell, and Bennion, 1987).

In 1971, AASA published the report of a study prepared by the AASA Commission on the Preparation of Professional School Administrators and edited by Stephen Knezevich. In that study, superintendents were asked to rate the importance they attached to various graduate courses. Courses such as school finance, personnel administration, public relations, school business management, legal aspects of education, and school plant planning were considered the most important by the respondents (Knezevich, 1971).

AASA repeated the survey in 1982. Six courses that ranked high were school finance, legal aspects of education, school business management, personnel administration, human relations, and public relations (Cunningham and Hentges, 1982). Superintendents were also

asked what information and skills were needed to be effective administrators. In 1971, the skills that were ranked most important included human relations, knowledge of educational and social change, finance, and skills in planning and management technologies. In 1982, the most important skills included general management, human relations, skills in planning and management technologies, finance, and knowledge of social and educational change. Despite the marked societal and educational changes that occurred in the ten years between these two studies, the ranking by superintendents remained remarkably similar.

In 1982 AASA published Guidelines for the Preparation of School Administrators, which outlined competencies and skills believed necessary for public school administrators. The competencies and skills relate to seven leadership outcome goals including: improving school climate; building support for education through an understanding of political theory; developing and delivering an effective, systematic curriculum; planning and implementing an instructional management system; designing staff development and evaluation systems; allocating resources to enhance student learning; conducting and using educational research. One stated purpose of the document was to assist state departments of education and training institutions in:

1. Refining certification and doctoral programs in educational administration;
2. Preparing for state, regional, or national accreditation visits;
3. Strengthening the profession. (Hoyle, 1982, p. 2)

However, since publication there has been no widespread acceptance of this series of competencies as criteria for the certification of superintendents.

Each state has its own set of policies and regulations controlling the certification of school administrators. A survey of these certification requirements was conducted during the 1984-85 school year. Representatives of state departments of education, school districts, and university departments of educational administration were asked if state standards had been altered or were currently being altered as a result of education reports and calls for reform. Eighty-nine percent reported changing or considering changes in certification requirements (Gousha, 1987).

A second survey was conducted during the 1985-86 school year. Of the respondents from the first survey, 20% had proceeded with additional changes in standards. If this trend continued, nearly all state departments of education, school districts, and colleges or universities should have now experienced some change in preparation, certification, and employment standards for school administrators. In all cases the standards for school leaders were increased (Gousha, 1987).

Peterson and Finn (1988) studied the relationship between preparation programs and state certification requirements. They pointed out that preparation programs closely paralleled certification requirements. They both stressed building management versus instructional leadership. Skills in school law and finance were emphasized instead of what constitutes good teaching, how to select texts, or how to determine whether student learning is consistent with level of ability.

The need to improve the preparation of school administrators has become increasingly visible through the dissemination of numerous recommendations for reform including:

- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, School Leadership Preparation: A Preface for Action (1988);
- American Association of School Administrators, Skills for Successful School Leaders (1985);
- National Association of Elementary School Principals, Principals for 21st Century Schools (1989);
- National Association of Secondary School Principals, Organizing for Learning: Toward the 21st Century (1989);
- National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, Leaders for America's Schools (1988);
- National Governors' Association, Time for Results: The Governors' Report on Education (1986);
- National Policy Board for Educational Administration, Improving the Preparation of School Administrators: An Agenda for Reform (1989).

Activities in support of reform would benefit from an analysis of state-level certification requirements for the superintendency. The study reported here had three purposes: (1) to inventory the types of requirements for state certification of superintendents; (2) to identify the similarities and differences between and among the states; (3) to compare the current status of superintendent certification to the recommendations for improving the pre-service preparation of school administrators.

Design of the Study

The data for the study were compiled by sending requests for a detailed explanation of superintendent certification requirements to the chief certification officer at state departments of education in each of the fifty states and the District of Columbia. Richard Mastain's 1988 update of the NASDTEC Manual was used as a reference to obtain the appropriate name and address for each department. This manual, published by the National Association of State Directors of Teacher

Education and Certification, includes summaries of certification requirements for each state.

The return rate was 100%. However, the information received varied in format and type. Some departments simply responded with handwritten notes on the original letter while others sent certification booklets or pages of state law.

When all responses were received, the information was compiled in a database for comparison. The database selected for the study was Enable (2.0 version), which is an integrated software package. The database definition included the name of each state and fields for the following requirements: years of teaching experience; years of administrative experience; years of educational experience; entry test; minimum degree; number of graduate hours; length of certificate; type of certificate; reciprocity; recency of studies and experience; internship; assessment center experience; specific coursework; and effective date of the requirements.

Inventory of State-Level Requirements for Certification of Superintendents

No two states have exactly the same standards for the certification of superintendents. However, analysis of the documents provided by the state education agencies revealed categories of requirements common to many states.

Degree Requirements

Forty-one states require the completion of a specific graduate degree as a minimum requirement for certification for superintendents. Thirty-four (82.9%) require a master's degree. Seven states (17.1%) require an educational specialist degree, six-year certificate, or certificate of advanced study. No states require a doctoral degree for the superintendency. Interestingly, the area(s) of concentration or major departments of study were not typically specified in the documents provided by the state agencies. Only Arkansas indicated that a degree in educational administration is required. Table 1 lists the states with minimum degree requirements.

Table 1
States and Minimum Degrees Required for Superintendency

Master's	Specialist	Not Specified
AK KY NJ TX	AL	CA NE
AR LA NM UT	IA	FL NH
AZ MD NV VA	ID	IL PA
CO ME NY VT	IN	KS SC
CT MI OH WA	MO	MA SD
DC MN OK WV	NC	
DE MS OR WY	WI	
GA MT RI		
HI ND TN		

Graduate Course Hours

Twenty-two states reported a specific number of graduate hours required for certification for the superintendency. Of the twenty-two, thirteen (59%) require sixty graduate hours. The other eight states

require less than sixty hours. Minnesota reported hours as quarter hours rather than semester hours. Listed in Table 2 are the twenty-two states and requirements for graduate hours.

Table 2
States Requiring a Specified Number of Graduate Hours

State	Hours	State	Hours
AR	B + 60	MI	M + 10
AZ	60	MN	M + 45 (quarters)
CO	B + 60	NE	60
CT	M + 30	NH	CAGS
DE	M + 30	NM	20
HI	B + 30	NY	B + 60
IA	M + 30	OK	M + 9
IL	30	RI	B + 36
KY	60	VA	60
LA	48	WA	M + 10
MD	60	WY	60

Specific Course Requirements

Thirty-eight state education agencies identify specific course requirements. Categories of courses include: foundations of education, including combinations of history of education, philosophy of education, psychology; curriculum and instruction, including supervision of teaching, teaching, learning, special education; organizational studies, including administration, leadership, organizational theory, organizational improvement; policy studies, including politics of education, educational policy analysis, federal policy, state policy, school board relationships; management processes and technologies, including personnel administration, school facilities, school law, school finance, business

Table 3
Course Requirements

State	Courses					
	Foundations	C & I	Organization	Policy Studies	Management	Research
AL						*
AZ					*	
CA		*				
CO		*	*		*	
CT	*	*	*	*	*	
DC	*					
DE		*			*	
GA		*	*			*
IA	*	*	*		*	
IL		*		*	*	
IN	*	*	*		*	*
KS		*	*		*	
KY	*	*			*	*
LA	*	*	*		*	*
MA	*	*	*		*	*
MD		*				
ME	*	*	*	*	*	
MI		*	*		*	
MO		*	*		*	*
MT		*	*		*	*
ND		*	*		*	
NE		*	*	*	*	*
NH		*	*	*	*	*
NJ		*	*		*	
NM		*			*	
NV		*	*		*	
OH	*	*	*	*	*	*
OK		*	*		*	
OR		*		*	*	
PA	*	*	*	*	*	*
RI		*	*		*	*
TN	*	*	*		*	*
TX		*	*		*	
UT		*	*	*	*	
VA	*	*	*		*	*
VT		*	*		*	*
WV			*		*	
WY		*	*		*	

administration, computer technology, planning, management science; and research.

Table 3 specifies the course requirements reported by each state agency. However, this information can be very misleading. Some states require programs that are competency-based. In most cases, the institutions of higher education that provide these programs translate the competency requirements into courses or series of courses.

Teaching Experience

Of the fifty-one departments of education, only twenty-six require a specific number of years of classroom experience. The number of years required ranges from one to five. The most common requirement reported by twenty of the twenty-six states was three years. States that require teaching experience to obtain a superintendency and the number of years of experience required are listed in Table 4.

Table 4
States and Years of Teaching Experience Required

Years			
1	2	3	5
MS	IL	AK MI	IA
	KS	AL MN	
	NE	AR MT	
	OK	AZ NH	
		DE NM	
		ID NV	
		IN TX	
		KY VT	
		MD WV	
		ME WY	

Of the twenty-five states that did not report a specific teaching experience requirement, 14 require "educational" experience, including, for example, work as a school counselor, school psychologist, or school librarian.

Administrative Experience

Fifteen departments of education require candidates for a superintendent's license or certificate to have other administrative experiences in schools. Table 5 identifies those states and the number of years of administrative experience required.

Table 5
States and Required Administrative Experience

Years of Experience				
1	2	3	4	5
NC	IL	CT		LA
OK	KY	HI		VA
	MD	IA		
	ND	ME		
	SC	NJ		
	VT	OH		

Eight states require both administrative and teaching experience (see Table 6).

Table 6
States Requiring Administrative and Teaching Experience

State	Administrative Years	Teaching Years
IA	3	5
IL	2	2
KY	2	3
MD	2	3
ME	3	3
NJ	3	3
OK	1	2
VT	2	3

Layered Certificates

Nine states (18%) require a series of certifications leading up to certification for the superintendency. These are Alabama, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, and Texas. A common system was for applicants to become certified and serve as teachers and then principals or supervisors before applying for a superintendent's certificate or endorsement.

State Approved Programs

An issue that arises time and again relative to certification requirements relates to the expectation that applicants for certification complete a state approved program. The differentiation is simple. Do candidates need only to accumulate a specified number of graduate course hours to be eligible for certification for the superintendency? Or, do candidates need to complete an integrated, systematic program approved by the state education agency? Eight states (16%) award certification based on courses accumulated rather than completion of a state-approved program, i.e., DC, DE, IA, ME, RI, SC, VT, WY. Twenty-nine states (56%) reported having an approved program system (Table 7). Four states (8%)

reported having both systems of certification (MT, NE, NH, NJ).

Table 7
States That Require Completion of an Approved Program

State Approved Programs					
AK	GA	MA	MO	OH	TX
AR	ID	MD	MS	OK	VA
CA	IL	MI	NC	OR	WA
CO	KS	MN	NM	PA	WI
CT	KY		NY	SD	WV

Certification Examinations

Thirteen of the fifty-one departments (26%) reported a requirement for an entry test prior to certification (Table 8). The test most commonly required is the administration portion of the National Teachers Examination.

Table 8
States Requiring an Entry Exam for the Superintendency

States						
AR	CA	IL	MT	NH	OK	WV
AZ	GA	MS	NE	OH	SC	

Assessment Center Experience

Missouri was the only state that indicated an assessment center was required. The National Governors' Commission (1986) had reported that Mississippi had established its version of an assessment center which was mandatory for all administrators. However, the requirement did not

appear in the certification materials received from Mississippi.

Supervised Field Experience

Nineteen states reported that an internship or practicum was required for potential superintendents. The nature of the field experience and the manner in which the requirement is implemented were generally not specified in the materials provided. States requiring an internship or practicum are identified in Table 9.

Table 9
States Requiring an Internship or Practicum

States				
AL	IA	MA	NY	UT
AZ	ID	ME	OH	WI
CA	IL	MN	OR	WY
CO	KS	NE	TX	

Types of Certificates

Is the certificate a separate superintendent's certificate or an added endorsement to an administrative certificate? Of the fifty-one responding departments of education, twenty-two reported having generic administrative certificates and twenty-three states reported having separate superintendent certificates. This represented approximately 44% in each category. Four states (8%) reported having both types of certificates for superintendents. Two states, Florida and Hawaii, reported that neither type of certificate was mandatory for their superintendents. Florida has no requirement for superintendents to be certified. The Florida Department of Education has developed certification standards although superintendents are not required to have completed the

qualifications to be elected or appointed. Hawaii listed minimum qualifications but stated that the State Superintendent was appointed by the State Board of Education and that the local superintendents were appointed by the State Superintendent. The type of certificate required for the superintendency in each state is presented in Table 10.

Table 10
Types of Certificate Required for Superintendents

Type of Certificate		
Administrative	Superintendent	Both
AK ID ND TN	AL LA NH SD	IL
AR IN NJ UT	AZ MA OH VA	MT
CA KY NM WV	CT MD OK VT	NE
CO MI NV WY	DC ME PA WA	TX
GA MN NY	DE MO RI WI	
IA MS OR	KS NC SC	

Length of Certificate

Twenty-two states did not report the duration of a superintendent's certificate. Of the remaining twenty-nine departments, the number of years before recertification ranged from one year to life. Five years was most commonly accepted as the length of a superintendent's certification with fifteen of the twenty-nine departments reporting five years. The other departments were split with seven states issuing certificates valid for less than five years and seven valid for longer than five years.

Pennsylvania is the only state with a certificate valid for life. Texas also has a certificate valid for life, but the certificate is unavailable until one five-year certificate expires. The states reporting

duration and the number of years are included in Table 11.

Table 11
States and Duration of Superintendent's Certificate

Years of Duration							
1	2	3	5		6	10	Life
MS	MN	UT	AK	ME	AZ	AL	PA
ND	OR	WV	CA	MI	NV	AR	
OK			DC	MT		MO	TX
			GA	NM		NE	
			IL	RI			
			IN	WI			
			KY	WY			

Recency Requirements

Nine states reported a recency requirement, i.e., coursework must be completed within a specified period of time. This represents only 17% of the nation. The nine states include Alaska, Alabama, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Michigan, North Dakota, Nevada, Virginia, and Utah.

Reciprocity

Three states reported reciprocity agreements for a superintendent's certificate. These states were Iowa, Illinois, and Pennsylvania. Other states would require application based on statewide standards.

Changes in Certification Requirements

The effective dates of certification requirements were not provided by all states. The states that did provide the dates and have changed certification requirements since January 1, 1987, are listed in Table 12.

Table 12
Effective Dates for Certification Requirements

Effective Dates of Certification Since 1987					
State	Date	State	Date	State	Date
AK	87/04/09	IL	88/07/01	OH	87/07/01
AL	87/01/23	KY	87/07/20	OR	88/03/01
AR	87/09/01	ME	88/03/29	RI	88/01/01
CA	87/03/01	MI	88/07/01	WA	88/04/04
ID	88/07/01	NE	87/09/01	WV	88/07/01

DISCUSSION

With little or no exception, certification standards have remained as described by the National Governors' Association in Time for Results: The Governors' Report on Education (1985, p. 53):

> What about training of administrators? Research indicates that "most university departments of educational administration use a training structure that is largely irrelevant to the work structure a principal will face on the job" (Manasse). Cohen reports that there "is a considerable gap between current knowledge about effective principals and the practices for training, selecting, managing, and supporting principals." Lynn Cornett of the Southern Regional Education Board concluded that entrance standards for preservice training programs are "generally minimal" and consist of a master's level program. Often the programs are characaterized by a series of courses, taken on a part-time basis by teachers desiring additional hours for re-certification. Programs generally include courses in management, instruction, school finance, and law. Programs are heavily knowledge-based. Practical experience is usually limited to a practicum or internship which is usually set by the student with little coordination between campus faculty and school personnel (Cornett).
>
> Principals with who we talked agreed with researchers' concerns about the quality of preservice training. And the American Association of School Administrators concluded that if the preparation of school administrators is not improved, it will "soon translate into burdens to be endured by generations of adults" (AASA).

Cooper and Boyd (1988) described current methods of preparing and certifying school administrators as state-controlled, closed to non-teachers, mandatory for all entering the profession, university-based, credit-driven, and certification bound. Individuals in and outside of the profession of educational administration recognize and assert the need for improvement.

State policymakers have been active in designing strategies and tactics to strengthen schools. Most states report activities to improve the preparation of school administrators currently underway by governors, state education agencies, legislative subcommittees, or state-wide comittees. The responsibility for developing and implementing improved standards for certification is not an easy task as state policymakers wrestle with the identification of best practices and negotiate new directions among stakeholders, including professors, practitioners, and aspiring candidates for administrative positions.

To make a difference in the preparation of school leaders, improvement efforts need to focus on the building blocks of reform. In Improving the Preparation of School Administrators: An Agenda for Reform, the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPB) identified the following needs:

- Recruitment of a diverse pool of highly able candidates;
- Development of a professional degree for school administrators (the Ed.D);
- Program requirements that include one full year of full-time study and one full-time year of field residency;
- Program content that transmits a common core of knowledge and skills, grounded in the problems of practice, including: societal and cultural influences on schooling; teaching and learning processes and school improvement; organizational

theory; methodologies of organizational studies and policy analysis; leadership and management processes and functions; policy studies and politics of education; moral and ethical dimensions of schooling;

- o Formal arrangements with exemplary schools, school districts, and school administrators to provide skillful mentors to potential administrators and meaningful field experiences;
- o Preparation programs adequately staffed by professors who demonstrate excellence in teaching, research, and service;
- o Quality control mechanisms to regulate entry into the profession and high standards of program effectiveness.

Certification standards are not the only mechanisms available to state policymakers who want to improve school leadership. Many states are developing and implementing other initiatives targeted toward recruitment, curriculum development, professional development, and assessment of competencies of individual candidates for administrative positions. But, certification standards do represent one available mechanism for influencing improvement of the profession. Some of the standards inventoried in this paper touch on the building blocks of reform:

- o Course requirements in some states relate directly to the skills and information educational leaders need to work with diverse populations, diverse educational needs, complex organizational structures, and professional educators;
- o Internship and practicum requirements address the need for aspiring school administrators to work directly with effective practicing administrators and in situations that allow practice, action, reflection, and feedback;
- o Prerequisite experiences in classrooms, or schools, or school districts focus on the importance of a thoughtful and

professional perspective on the work of schools -- teaching and learning;

- o Requirements for completion of a graduate degree recognize the need for systematic and integrated preparation programs;
- o Examinations for entry to the profession and program review procedures are attempts to respond to the quality control needs of the profession.

However, other standards reflect the history of accomodations in the preparation of school administrators that contribute to the weaknesses characteristic of the field:

- o Course requirements that focus solely on the managerial tasks of the school administrator miss the complexities of contemporary schools and the needs of professional educators;
- o Internship requirements that can be met part-time, before and after school, in the intern's place of employment, without meaningful mentoring do not provide the range and types of experiences important to the potential administrator;
- o Standards that permit an individual to attain administrative certification by accumulating courses as a non-degree student in colleges or universities that do not have state approved programs foster segmentation, remove educational administration programs from the responsibility for developing relevant programs, and continue the cycle of inadequate preparation.

Improvement will take time, patience, and the coordinated efforts of state policymakers, practitioners, and professors. Improving standards for the certification of superintendents is one place to start.

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
1.	States and Minimum Degrees Required for Superintendents	7
2.	States Requiring a Specified Number of Graduate Hours	8
3.	Course Requirements	9
4.	States and Years of Teaching Experience Required	10
5.	States and Required Administrative Experience	11
6.	States Requiring Administrative and Teaching Experience	12
7.	States and State Approved Programs	13
8.	States Requiring an Entry Exam for the Superintendency	13
9.	States Requiring an Internship or Practicum	14
10.	Types of Certificates Required for Superintendents	15
11.	States and Duration of Superintendent's Certificate	16
12.	Effective Dates for Certification Requirements	17

REFERENCES

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, (1988). School leadership preparation: A preface for action. Washington, D.C.: Author.

American Association of School Administrators, (1985). Skills for successful school leaders. Arlington, VA: Author.

Campbell, R.F., Fleming, T., Newell, L.J. & Bennion, J.W., (1987). A history of thought and practice in educational adminstration. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cooper, B.S. & Boyd, W.L., (1988). The evolution of training for school administrators. In Griffiths, D.E., Stout, R.T. & Forsyth, P.B. (Eds.), Leaders for America's schools (pp. 251-272). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing.

Cunningham, L. & Hentges, J., (1982). The American school superintendency, 1982, a full report. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Gousha, R.P., LoPresti, P.L. & Jones, J.H., (1987). "Standards are changing for school administrators," The School Administrator, 44(2), 12-13.

Griffiths, D.E., Stout, R.T. & Forsyth, P.B., (Eds.), (1988). Leaders for America's schools: The report and papers of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. Berkley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Hoyle, J., (1982). Guidelines for the preparation of school administrators. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Knezevich, S.J., (Ed.), (1971). The American school superindency. Arlington, VA: AASA Commission on the Preparation of Professional School Administrators.

Mastain, R.K., (Ed.), (1988). The NASDTEC manual: Manual on certificaion and preparation of educational personnel in the United States. Washington, D.C.: National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification.

National Association of Elementary School Principals, (1988). Principals for the 21st century schools. Alexandria, VA: Author.

National Association of Secondary School Principals, (1989). Organizing for learning: Toward the 21st century. Reston, VA: Author.

National Governors' Association, (1986). Time for results: The governors' 1991 report on education. Washington, D.C.: Author.

National Policy Board for Educational Administration, (1989). Improving the preparation of school adminstrators: An agenda for reform. Charlottesville, VA: Author.

Peterson, K. & Finn, C., (1988). Principals, superintendents, and the administrator's art. In Griffiths, D.E., Stout, R.T. & Forsyth, P.B. (Eds.), Leaders for America's schools (pp. 89-108). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing.

ABOUT THE NATIONAL POLICY BOARD FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

The National Policy Board for Educational Administration is representative of practitioners, faculty members, and policy makers in the field of educational administration who are committed to reform in their profession. The Board was officially formed on January 20, 1988.

The National Policy Board consists of representatives from the following ten member organizations:

- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
- American Association of School Administrators
- Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
- Association of School Business Officials
- Council of Chief State School Officers
- National Association of Elementary School Principals
- National Association of Secondary School Principals
- National Council of Professors of Educational Administration
- National School Boards Association
- University Council for Educational Administration

The Board's charter outlines three purposes:

(1) To develop, disseminate, and implement professional models for the preparation of educational leaders;

(2) To increase the recruitment and placement of women and minorities in positions of educational leadership; and

(3) To establish a national certifying board for educational administrators.